

Can the shapes that are shown be accepted as indicative of structures present? Again, the answer may lie in the presentation of the church and courthouse, both shown with attendant vestibule, nave, and chamber. The proportions are not accurate, nor does it appear that it was Sauthier's intent to make the map absolutely accurate.

The reason for delving into this issue so intensely is to cite other examples of the problem which exists with the dimensions of the "Snuff and Tobacco Manufacture." The map clearly shows a building located on a small fenced lot in approximately the same location as that mentioned in the above deed. The map dimensions for the building would define a building consisting of a large 60 foot square structure with a 30 foot square appendage on the west side. Behind the building (i.e., to the south) are two small garden plots and a small outbuilding (which measures 30 feet on each side according to the map). Extending from the southeast corner of the building, around the garden plots and continuing to the edge of the pond, is a thin line, a symbol used elsewhere on the map to mark established property boundaries, possibly fences.

It is apparent that these dimensions are fully out of proportion to what must have been the real situation. The portrayal of the basic "L" shape of the building is reliable, but the oversized measurements are not. It is important to understand and follow the above argument, for the author wishes to reject the accuracy of the map in order to take another perspective on the architecture.

Without direct historical reference to the building, the archaeologist has turned to the realm of analogy to find an explanation of a phenomenon. The phenomenon being explored here is an oddly dimensioned cellar which contained certain features related to the building above. The argument which follows is based upon a preponderance of evidence from architectural features, archaeological data, and architectural analogy.

In order to provide a reconstruction of the building which stood on the site, it is necessary to make numerous assumptions about the architecture. The following interpretation of the building is, therefore, somewhat conjectural. We believe, however, that archaeological data support the interpretation. Architectural historians have agreed, with reservations, to its architectural feasibility (Edward Chappel, Personal Communication, 1978). The major reservation, expressed by McKelden Smith of the North Carolina Division of Archeology and Preservation, revolved around the removal of the axial chimney and its replacement with lateral ones. However, data refuting this contention will be supplied in the following discussion.

Sometime after ca. 1760 a small one bay frame structure was constructed on the northern end of the tanyard lot, probably to serve as a Snuff and Tobacco Manufacture. The dimensions of this